

## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum  
 United States & Europe—\$2.00  
 Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
 Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.  
 (Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.)  
 Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.  
 Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and orders for the CATHOLIC RECORD:  
 General agents: Messrs. P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty, and Miss Sara Hasky, Real-estate agents: D. J. Murray, Montreal; George B. Hewitson, Regina; Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss B. Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Heinger, Winnipeg; Miss Johnson, Ottawa and J. A. Hazen, Quebec.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGowan, 249 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co. Pharmacy, 109 Brussels Street.

In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from Mr. E. O'Grady, Newsdealer, 106 St. Viateur street, west, and J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1915

### CATHOLICITY AND CITY LIFE

That even a perfectly honest man may half-bake a pet theory by the manipulation of inadequate statistics is so well known that some humorist has not inaptly summed up such fallacy in the phrase—“Lies, Lies, Statistics!” statistics being in the superlative degree.

Our clerical readers will have read an interesting article of this kind contributed to the Ecclesiastical Review by Sacerdos whose pessimistic thesis caused a little flutter of discussion and some indignant refutation.

“No matter how fervent be the father and mother who take up their abode in a large city, their grandchildren or at the very furthest their great grandchildren will certainly be lost to the faith.”

Absolute, unconditional, inevitable, is the conclusion to which Sacerdos rides his little hobby. Had he but added “under present conditions,” or some such qualifying clause that might light up the unrelieved gloom with the hope of better things to come; had he indicated to the younger generation of priests some hitherto neglected opening for their zeal and energy in the service of God there might be utility and point in the article.

But yes, there is one little glimmer of hope left. Following the statement quoted above Sacerdos says:

“The only possible check on this speedy destruction will be in cases where their children or grandchildren choose people of country training for their life partners.”

Young priests and aspirants to the priesthood need not give themselves entirely to despair nor city Catholics to inevitable perdition. Even at the cost of giving up some of the present flourishing but futile parish activities every city parish should have a Eugenic Society for promoting intermarriage between rural and urban Catholics. “The only possible” means surely should not be neglected.

Seriously, however,—for Sacerdos is a serious parish priest in charge of a city parish of 1,786 souls—let us consider the fundamental fallacy underlying the good priest's statistics. For it is on the statistics of his parish for ten years that he builds his theory. True he ekes out by some world sweeping generalizations and animadversions; but, as he does not fail to remind his critics, it is on the bed rock of his own detailed information with regard to his own parish that he bases his irrefutable thesis.

In passing we may note the value of such generalizations and animadversions. With scientific solemnity Sacerdos prefaces his sweeping assertions:

“One of our staff has visited Europe with the view of learning something of conditions in other cities. We take the liberty of adding some of the facts collected.”

Passing over various French, Italian, or German-speaking cities we come to Dublin where the Envoy extraordinary should meet with the least difficulty on his mission. Rhapsodizing over Irish faith and missionary spirit he gets the proper setting for the proof of his pet theory.

“Dublin has its Catholics who do not practise their religion. Its police records show that every year over a thousand fathers and mothers in poverty and degradation sell their children to proselytes.”

Sad reading; but we are sure no reader of the Ecclesiastical Review in America doubted for a moment the accuracy of the statement. Least of all Sacerdos himself. But there are readers of the Review in Dublin. Father Paul, O.F.S.C., is a subscriber, in a subsequent number of the Review he writes:

“After reading the above I took your Review in my hand and went to interview one of the police officers. I read the passage for him, and on hearing it the worthy man exclaimed: ‘Why, Father, the whole story is outlandishly absurd. There is no such record in the Police Courts. The record we have is that of the children sent by the Magistrates to the Industrial Schools, and to the Union. The Industrial Schools, as you know, are practically all under Catholic control. It is only when the parents are Protestants that a child is sent to a Protestant Industrial School. The children sent to the Union are placed under the care of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul.’”

Whether the rest of the European “facts” are as unreliable does not really matter.

That one can trace all good Catholics in a certain parish back to country origin is not surprising in a new country where cities are of mushroom growth.

Take, for example, Toronto. The father of a citizen forty five or fifty years old was born probably eighty, ninety or a hundred years ago. In 1821 Toronto had 1,776 inhabitants, not Catholic inhabitants, but 1,776 all told. It was not till 1884 that York was incorporated as the city of Toronto with a population of 9,254. In 1850 the population had reached only 30,776 and ten years afterwards was a little more than 45,000. Up to that time according to our theorist it would hardly count as a city as he says: “Many of our smaller cities of say ten, twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants, perhaps more, resemble the country.” So that it is only within the last half-century that even the Queen City of Ontario would come into this category at all. Its rapid development is thus indicated by the Census:

1871	115,000
1881	155,000
1891	219,616
1901	267,780
1911	470,480

Increasing at the same rate since 1911 its population should now be about 600,000. No one supposes that the 1,776 inhabitants of “dirty little York” of ninety years ago were the progenitors of the 600,000 Torontonians of to-day. Nor even that the 155,000 of 1881 have so well observed the scriptural mandate as to have multiplied by natural increase into Toronto's present day population.

Moreover, it is a well-known fact that the cities have grown at the expense of the country; the rural population of Ontario in the last forty years showing not only a relative but an absolute decrease.

Now suppose Sacerdos' parish of 1,786 souls were a part of Toronto's 600,000. No one can fail to see that any statistics of such a parish are utterly and ludicrously inadequate to justify any general conclusions even for the city of Toronto; and they make a very small statistical point on which to stand his inverted pyramid of general conclusions.

A parish comprising less than 1 per cent of the whole population might or might not be very misleading so far as positive statistics go; but in the circumstances, to draw conclusions from negative indications is setting the pace for the most advanced statistical hobbyists. And Toronto may be taken as fairly typical of cities on this continent.

It is quite likely that the jails, reformatories and lunatic asylums of this province would show an overwhelming proportion of inmates whose “fathers or grand fathers or at least great-grandfathers” were from the country. Would it be reasonable to infer, not to emphasize, that rural life is responsible for crime, waywardness and insanity? No, the only conclusion that could reasonably be drawn from such facts is the one we knew before—that this is a new country, whose urban population is practically all drawn from rural sources.

Nevertheless, in spite of his pessimistic and unreasoning obsession, Sacerdos shows a commendable example in collecting information; if generally followed valuable data might be provided for unbiased study and analysis which would prove of great interest, perhaps of great service, and lead to conclusions practical and useful.

### HALL CAINE AND THE POPE

Hall Caine, who recently wrote an open letter to President Wilson instructing him in his duties as a neutral, has now sent an open epistle to Pope Benedict pointing out to that ecclesiastical ruler that he shouldn't say or do anything calculated to bring about peace at this time. To put it mildly, Mr. Caine seems to be suffering from a rather severe attack of exaggerated ego. There is a chance, however, that the novelist has a keen appreciation of the value

of high class advertising.—The Ottawa Citizen.

Hall Caine misses no advertising chances. Some years ago he got very effective advertising by placing a Pope on the stage as one of the characters in a play of his now forgotten. The Pope was no more necessary to the plot or action than the man in the moon; but he was extremely useful to the press agent by provoking an endless discussion of the good or bad taste of the author, the propriety of thus treating the spiritual head of Christendom, and, incidentally of course, of the play itself.

### AS SEEN BY A CONVERT

THE CHURCH AND A VISIBLE HEAD

We concluded our previous article with the intimation that in this present article we would adduce the testimony of those Early Fathers of the Church whom we specifically named to establish the fact that St. Peter was in succession to Our Lord in the flesh, the first visible head of the Church on earth; and, further, that we would likewise adduce the testimony of a similar array of the Early Fathers that in the Chair of Authority in the Church there must always be a legitimate successor of St. Peter. The first witness we named was Tertullian, who, writing in the opening years of the 3rd century, says: “Was anything hidden from Peter, who was called the rock, and whereon the Church was built—and who obtained ‘the keys of the Kingdom of heaven,’ and the power of loosing and of binding in heaven and on earth?” Our next witness named was Tertullian's contemporary, Origen, who writes: “Observe what is said by the Lord to that great foundation of the Church and to the most solid rock, upon which Christ founded the Church, ‘O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?’” And Origen says again: “That Peter should have something peculiar above those (the other disciples); this was previously ordained separately respecting Peter; thus I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and truly, if we sedulously attend to the Gospel writings, even in them we may discover even in regard to those things which seem to be common to Peter, and to those (the other disciples), much difference and pre-eminence in the words spoken to Peter beyond those spoken to in the second place.” Origen is followed by St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the 3rd century, in whose testimony is of great value because he is said to have withstood the alleged encroachments of Pope Victor, and Pope Stephen, on his prerogatives as a Bishop. Concerning St. Peter's position in the Church St. Cyprian writes: “Herself (the Church) was founded first and alone by the voice of our Lord upon Peter.” “First to Peter, upon whom He built the Church, and from whom He instituted and showed that unity should spring; the Lord gave this power that that should be loosed in heaven which he should have loosed on earth.” St. Cyprian further writes: “Whither shall he come that thirsteth? To heretics, where the fountain and river of water is no way life-giving—or to the Church, which is one, and was by the voice of the Lord founded upon one, who also received the keys thereof?” The name next appearing on our list of witnesses is that of St. James of Nisibis, who sat in the great Council of Nicaea. He writes: “Simon, the head of the Apostles, . . . Our Lord received him, and made him the foundation, and called him the rock of the edifice of the Church.” St. Hilary, whose name follows that of St. James of Nisibis, says: “The Son of God took up Peter, to whom He had just before given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and upon whom He was about to build the Church, against which the gates of hell should never prevail, who, whatever he should bind or loose on earth, should be bound and loosed in heaven.” St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of “Peter also, the foremost of the Apostles, and the keybearer of the kingdom of heaven.” While St. Gregory of Nyssa writes: “The memory of St. Peter, the head of the Apostles, is celebrated, for he is, agreeably to the gift conferred upon him by Our Lord, that unbroken and most firm rock upon which the Lord built His Church.” Following him comes St. Gregory of Nazianzen, who testifies: “That, of the disciples of Christ, all of whom were great and deserving of His choice, one is called a rock, and is entrusted with the foundations of the Church.” And again, “Peter became the unbroken rock, and had the keys delivered to him.” St. Basil

says: “One of these mountains was Peter, upon which rock Christ promised to build His Church.” He further says: “That blessed Peter, who was preferred before all the disciples; who alone received a greater testimony and blessing than the rest; he to whom were entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” The evidence is continued by St. Epiphanius, who tells us: “The blessed Peter was the chiefest of the Apostles, who became unto us truly a firm rock, upon which is based the Lord's faith (i.e. the faith of Christians), upon which rock the Church is every way built.” Nor is the fearless and holy St. Ambrose less explicit in what he says when he writes: “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and to thee will I give the keys,” etc. How, could He not confirm his faith, unto whom, of His own authority, He gave the kingdom, and whom, when He styled a ‘rock,’ He pointed out the foundation of the Church?” St. Jerome testifies that: “In accordance with the metaphor of a ‘rock’ I will build My Church on thee.” The eloquent St. Chrysostom says of St. Peter: “When I name Peter, I name that unbroken ‘rock,’ that firm foundation, that great Apostle, the first of the disciples.” St. Asterius writes: “The Only Begotten, as is said in the Gospels, denominates Peter the Church's foundation. ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.’” Coming now to St. Augustine of Hippo, it is only right that we should point out that in a controversy with the Arians, his object being to show that the true doctrine of the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ lay at the foundation of His Church, this great Father quotes the text, “Thou art Peter,” etc., applying the term “rock” to Our Lord. Much is made of this by non-Catholics; but what St. Augustine is demonstrating is, that, if Our Lord was not Divine, if His Incarnation was not really the fact that the Gospel narratives represent it to be, that text would be meaningless; but if the Divinity and miraculous Incarnation of Our Lord be conceded, then He is the “Rock” or chief Corner stone on which His Church is built, and it is St. Peter's identification with Him as the chief Corner stone, as His first visible representative, that constitutes that Apostle the “rock” upon which according to Christ's promise the Church is built. In St. Augustine's writings, let us here observe, may be found the strongest claims of preeminence for the See of St. Peter. St. Leo the Great shall be our last witness, and he writes: “That which the Truth ordered remains; and blessed Peter, persisting in that strength of the rock which he received, has not deserted the guidance, once undertaken, of the Church. For thus he is set before the rest, that while he is called the Rock, while he is declared the foundation, while he is appointed the door keeper of the Kingdom of heaven, while he is advanced to be judge of what shall be bound and what loosed, with the condition that his sentence shall be ratified even in heaven, we might learn through the very mysteries of the names given to him, how he was associated with Christ.”

We now turn to the evidence we promised to adduce that there must be a legitimate line of successors of St. Peter in the Chair of Authority in the Church. We cite as our first witness St. Cyprian, of whom it is alleged by Dr. Wordsworth, an Anglican “scholar,” that he (St. Cyprian) “knew nothing of supremacy in Pope Stephen.” And here let us remark that to be accepted and regarded by some persons as a “scholar” does not necessarily confer upon any person so accepted and regarded a just title to that distinction. We shall see that this is so in the case of Dr. Wordsworth. Writing to Antonianus respecting Pope Cornelius, St. Cyprian, at the beginning of his letter says: “You wrote that I should transmit a copy of the same letter to our colleague Cornelius, that, having been relieved of anxiety, he might at length know, that you communicate with him, that is, with the Catholic Church.” To those acquainted with the repeated declarations of St. Cyprian these concluding words we have italicized can have only one meaning; and that is, that the chair of St. Peter was regarded by him as authority in the Catholic Church, but also her representative. We find, for example, in his letter to Pope Cornelius himself St. Cyprian writes: “Peter, on whom the Church had been built by the Lord Himself, one speak-

ing for all and replying with the voice of the Church, exclaims, ‘Lord to whom shall we go?’” Again, in this same letter to Pope Cornelius, he says: “Moreover, after all this, a pseudo-bishop (i.e. a false bishop) having been set up for themselves by heretics, they dare to sail and carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the chair of Peter, and to the chief Church, where the unity of the Priesthood has begun.” And in the letter to Antonianus, from which we have already quoted, we read, where St. Cyprian writes of the election of Cornelius to the See of Rome, that it occurred “when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter, and the rank of the sacerdotal chair was vacant.” Pope Fabian was the predecessor of Pope Cornelius. We are left in no doubt whatever, therefore, as to how St. Cyprian regarded the Apostolic See. But it was obviously Dr. Wordsworth's intention to isolate the disagreement between Pope Stephen and some of the African Bishops, the latter represented by St. Cyprian, and by that one incident to establish that for which Dr. Wordsworth so earnestly contends, that St. Cyprian “knew nothing of supremacy in Pope Stephen.” In regard to that incident, St. Augustine of Hippo throws doubt upon the whole story, affirming that “the letters and documents were composed by presumptuous and deceitful men.” St. Augustine's knowledge of these facts is just as likely to be true as ours. Moreover, forgery, as all scholars know, is by no means only a modern crime. In respect to Maritimus, a heretic, St. Cyprian fully admitted supremacy in Pope Stephen. Our next witness, and we will now deal with the evidence of these Early Fathers more briefly, is St. Irenaeus, who, writing in the closing years of the 2nd century, declares: “To this Church (the Roman) on account of a more powerful principality (or spiritual jurisdiction), it is necessary that every Church, that is, those who are, on every side, faithful, resort, (because) in that Church . . . has been preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles.” To continue quoting similar testimony from others of the Early Fathers would only involve us in a repetition of that we have already adduced establishing the supremacy of St. Peter, and through him of all his successors in the Holy See, for the Fathers undoubtedly regarded the transmission of authority of the See of St. Peter as identical with the preservation of the true Faith, and the unity of the Church. St. Augustine of Hippo says: “Do not suppose that you hold to the true Catholic Faith, unless you hold that Faith which is preserved at Rome.” And Ben Asael, a monophysite heretic, writing on the famous Arabic Nicene Canons, gives the onerelating to the See of Rome as teaching the true doctrine concerning it. The words are as follows: “As the Patriarch is invested with supreme rule and authority over his subjects, so the Bishop of Rome has a supremacy of jurisdiction over all the patriarchs, since he has the primacy of St. Peter, so far as this, viz., that he is to enjoy the chief government of all the Bishops of the Christian Church, and of the members which compose it; so that, as the successor of our Lord, he is placed over His Church and people.”

### THE HONOR ROLL

“Pity the martyr dead? Nay, rather praise,  
 They need not pity who so nobly die.”

This is the thought that is uppermost in our hearts during these tragic days when the morning paper brings us an ever lengthening list of casualties. “Somewhere in France” our kith and kin lie stark and cold in death. The foeman's steel has pierced their brave young hearts. “Somewhere in France” they all a soldier's grave. They died that we might live. They have not died in vain. Their sealed lips preach, trumpet tongued, a message that thrills this grey old world. They have given their lives for honor and right and justice. They died for an ideal; for the sacredness of the bonded word. They died ennobled by the supreme sacrifice. For them we have no tears, but reverent admiration. Far be it from us to eulogize war; to laud the art of killing. War is accursed, but yet is the world better and richer for the example of these men who have honorably fallen. The pity of it that in this twentieth century they should be thus sacrificed.

Vividly as we realize our debt to the heroic dead, we are little minded to

lavish maudlin sympathy upon them. We feel that it would be an insult to their memory. But there are those to whom our tears are consecrated. For the soldier death has few terrors. But oh! the agony of the empty years for those who loved them? “Some-

where in France,” with banners waving in the sun, our soldier boys went to their death. But somewhere in this Canada of ours a mother sits out her heart in loneliness. To die in the joy of battle is easy. To live with a thousand memories that will not die—that is to die indeed. Let us have our Roll of Honor if we will, but let us inscribe thereon the names, not of the dead but of the living, for

“The bravest battle that ever was fought,  
 ‘Twas fought by the mothers of men.”

It is the mothers of our soldier boys who have given their all for King and Country. It is upon them the blighting curse of war falls heaviest. And it is their piteous broken hearts that cry out before the throne of God for vengeance upon the wreckers of their happiness. When the Last Bugle calls what answer will mad Ambition make to the tears of the widows and orphans it has made?

COLUMBA.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

SINCE THE beginning of the War many notable instances have been recorded of father and sons, or two or more brothers fighting side by side, or being in different branches of the service in Northern France or Flanders at one and the same time. But what is probably an unique record in the annals of War is the case of one Isaac Clarke, of Capford, in the County of Essex, England, the father of eleven sons, every one of whom is serving or has served in the Army or Navy. The King's attention was called to this with the result that a letter was forwarded to Mr. Clarke from Buckingham Palace, conveying His Majesty's congratulations upon his “having contributed in so full a measure to the great cause for which all the people of the British Empire are so bravely fighting.”

IN EXAMPLES of this kind Canada has not been wanting in the present crisis. The most remarkable that has come to our knowledge is that of Dr. John Amyot, Provincial Bacteriologist, who goes to Europe with three of his sons, in the Hospital Corps organized and equipped by the University of Toronto. This, we believe, constitutes a record so far as Canada is concerned, and it is one which may well be regarded with pride and gratification by Major Amyot's fellow Catholics and fellow-countrymen. Dr. Amyot's knowledge and experience in bacteriological research and the science of sanitation places him in a class by himself in this country, and the quality of the services he will be able to render upon the scene of hostilities is simply inestimable. At once a scientist of the first rank, and a Christian gentleman beyond reproach, Canada has no choicer gift to offer to her sons or to the mother country in this great international crisis than Ontario's official Bacteriologist.

MUCH has been written on the subject of German atrocities and of Germany's disregard of the rules of civilized warfare throughout the present hostilities, and many people in this country knowing well the virtues and other good qualities of her citizens of German extraction, have been loth to believe that those of the fatherland could be capable of the inhumanities and outrages so persistently charged against their armies in Flanders and elsewhere. The German as we know him in Canada, it is urged, is a kindly and peaceable individual: can it be possible that his brother in Europe is the heartless barbarian that press despatches represent him? The objection is a fair one, and international antipathies notwithstanding, merits consideration.

IT IS NOT to the German people as a whole, it may be said at once, or to the individual German that the undeniable atrocities of the present war are attributed so much as to the spirit which for more than a century has been systematically cultivated in the Prussian Army and has become the accepted code of its authorities. What this spirit is has been shown beyond dispute by the many German military text books which have been done into English since hostilities began. These have demonstrated to

conviction that every detail of the occupation of Belgium, and every brutality which has characterized that occupation was deliberately planned and is condoned on the plea of military necessity.

TWO OF THE leading French reviews, the Revue des Deux Mondes and the Revue de Paris, have had notable articles within the past few months explaining the theory upon which these German military atrocities are justified. A perusal of these articles will obviate any feeling of astonishment which otherwise such atrocities might have given rise to. They make clear that the whole German nation has been taught since the time of Frederick the Great that in war no consideration of law or humanity should stand against the commission of any act calculated to crush the moral or material resistance of the enemy. This creed, persistently inculcated, has become the recognized code of the Empire. While, therefore, Germany has apparently had no scruples in subscribing to Hague Conventions or in placidly acceding to international agreements calculated to reduce the horrors of war, she has all along taught in her schools and academies that no such compacts were binding where they ran counter to her own interests. In the light of this revelation the “scrap of paper” episode becomes the merest triviality.

GERMAN MILITARY science does not, it is true, contest the existence of a law of war. But Leider, one of its most eminent exponents, from their point of view, while allowing that humanity may have some weight so long as the end aimed at is not compromised, leaves it an open question whether true humanity does not sometimes dictate the employment of the most cruel and atrocious measures, in order the more speedily to end it. Every other consideration is, in his view, pure theory. Humanitarian principles may govern only when they do not jeopardize the result desired. Any act, on the other hand, is justifiable if it tends to shorten the resistance of the enemy—a theory equivalent to the denial of any civilized code of war whatever. Other nations have sometimes in the stress of circumstance acted upon this principle, but it has remained for German kultur to codify it.

UNTIL THE present war the immunity assured to non-combatants was looked upon as one of the greatest advances in modern war jurisprudence, but Germany, for her part, has shown this to be a pure illusion. Civilians have been executed by scores in Belgium and France; girls and women have been abused; helpless children have been mutilated; cities, churches and universities have been destroyed and whole regions laid waste—all of which Germany justifies on the plea that terror and outrage are legitimate weapons of war, that the torture of the few is the merest circumstance in the process of bringing the many to submission. Sherman in the American Civil War characterized War as “Hell” and in his own field of operations sought so to make it, but that was the act of the individual, for which he alone was responsible. War in any form can scarcely fail to be horrible in its results, but that truth in no way diminishes the difference between what are known as civilized and barbarous methods of carrying it on.

IN THE science of war as taught and, in the present juncture, acted upon by the Germans, distinction is made between the “Kriegsmaler” and the “Kriegsraiser”—that is to say, between the normal methods of civilized warfare, and the exceptional, when, according to the theory taught, everything is permissible. “It might have been thought,” says a writer in the Paris Revue, “and probably still is by the rest of mankind, that war must be made according to civilized laws or rules, or the belligerent must plainly state that he is independent of all such considerations.” Germany's crime in the present outbreak consists in having professed the desire to adhere to the one code while all the while preparing for the active prosecution of the other.

A PECULIARITY of the present situation, however, is that those responsible for Germany's conduct of the War seem to consider that while in certain cases they are at liberty to transgress every known law and principle of civilized warfare they